

### **REMARKS**

This paper is filed in response to the official action dated March 7, 2007 (hereafter, “the official action”). This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition to file in the first month and authorization to charge our deposit account no. 13-2855 in the amount of the requisite \$120 extension fee.

#### **Restriction Requirement**

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. The official action set forth a restriction requirement requiring that the applicants elect one of the following two groups of claims:

Group I: claims 1-17 and 25-32, which are drawn to an organic semiconductor device; and,

Group II: claims 18-24, which are drawn to a method of forming an organic semiconductor device.

The restriction requirement is respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The examiner correctly recognized that unity of invention practice, and not U.S. restriction practice under 35 U.S.C. §121, is applicable because this application is the U.S. national phase of an international (PCT) application. *See* M.P.E.P. §1893.03(d) (8<sup>th</sup> Ed. rev. 5, August 2006).

The applicants respectfully submit, however, that the groups I and II do not lack unity of invention because 37 CFR §1.475(1) provides that “[a]n international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories: (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product....”

Here, claims 1-17 and 25-32 (group I) are drawn to a product and claims 18-24 (group II) are drawn to a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product. Accordingly, all pending claims 1-32 relate to the same invention and are linked by the same general inventive concept. Thus, the restriction requirement should be removed.

**Provisional Election**

Pursuant to the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.143, the applicants provisionally elect Group I (claims 1-17 and 25-32) for continued prosecution in this application, with traverse.

**CONCLUSION**

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, he is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

May 7, 2007

/Andrew M. Lawrence/

Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130  
Attorney for Applicants  
6300 Sears Tower  
233 S. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300